

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 1-2, 6-7 and 9-10 are amended herein and new claim 14 is presented. No new matter is presented, and approval and entry of the amended specification and amended claims and new claim are respectfully requested.

Claims 12-13 are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1-10 and 14 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a device including "... a first unit leaving a first set of frames ...; a second unit discarding a second set of frame. . ., wherein the discarded second set of frames includes substantially the same frame as the corresponding frame; and ... wherein a current frame of the input video sequence is determined as whether the current frame is positioned at the predetermined interval based on a count value and the count value is reset when the current frame is determined to be positioned at the predetermined interval." Amendatory language being underlined.

Support for the amendment is found, for example, in Figs. 1 and 6 and page 11, line 27 to page 12, line 4 and page 15, line 15 to page 16, line 8 of the specification. Independent claim 6 is amended herein in a similar manner. Dependent claims 2 and 7 are amended herein accordingly.

Dependent claims 9-10 are amended herein to correct informalities. No new matter is presented, and approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Traverse of Rejections

The Examiner rejects claims 1-10 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. (See, Office Action at pages 2-13).

The rejections are traversed. Applicant submits that each of the Examiner's concerns is addressed herein.

* * *

Claims 12-13 are cancelled herein.

* * *

In rejecting independent claim 1, for example, the Examiner asserts:

Therefore a normal MPEG stream could not function be discarding unless as stated in the specification paragraph 77 "all of the preceding pictures(the first through third pictures are encoded from the same picture A".

(See, Office Action at 3, lines 8-11).

Independent Claim 1, for example, is amended herein to address the Examiner's concern and recite a device "wherein the discarded second set of frames includes substantially the same frame as the corresponding frame." Independent claim 6 is amended herein in a similar manner.

* * *

The Examiner also asserts:

In the process of page 15 and 16 only "head end" video packs are counted by the counter (see page 15 lines 15-25), video packs. . . . unclear how counting head end video packs would result in the function applicant describes it appears that no frames would be skipped each GOP because the counter would always read 1 after the head end video pack until the end of the GOP because each GOP has a head end video pack. . . . The specification does not define how reading the header information determines whether the currently read video pack the head-end video pack is a head end video pack in.

(See, Office Action at page 4, line 5 - page 5, line 6).

To address the Examiner's concern, independent claim 1, as amended herein, for example, replaces the limitation of "the first set of frames and the second set of frames include a plurality of video packs each of which includes header information, and the header information is read to determine whether a currently read video pack is a head-end video pack in the first set of frames or the second set of frames" with the feature --a current frame of the input video sequence is determined as whether the current frame is positioned at the predetermined interval based on a count value and the count value is reset when the current frame is determined to be positioned at the predetermined interval--. Independent claim 6 is amended herein in a similar manner.

* * *

The Examiner also asserts:

Page 15 states "In the following description, the term "frame" is used in the same meaning as the picture (or video pack)." But the claim uses the language "the first set of frames and the second set of frames include a plurality of video packs. This makes no sense because if a frame and video pack are the same thing a frame what does this limitation even mean.

(See, Office Action at page 4, lines 15 - 19).

The specification is amended herein to correct this informality and recite --In the following description, the term "frame" is used in the same meaning as the picture--.

Conclusion

Applicant submits the each of the Examiner's concerns are addressed and that independent claims 1 and 6 (and respective dependent claims 2-5 and 7-10) comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. Thus, the rejections should be withdrawn.

New Claim

Claim 14 is presented to recited features of an exemplary embodiment in a different manner. Claim 14 recites a device including "a first unit capable of leaving a first set of frames at intervals in a sequence; a second unit discarding a second set of frames to cause an encoding unit to perform predictive coding of a corresponding frame of the first set of frames immediately preceding a frame from the second set of frames, wherein the discarded second set of frames includes substantially a same frame as the corresponding frame; and a processor capable of determining whether a current frame is positioned at a predetermined interval based on a count value and capable of resetting the count value upon determining the current frame is positioned at the predetermined interval."

No new matter is presented, and approval and entry of the new claim are respectfully requested. Applicant submits that claim 14 complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: June 17, 2009

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501